

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

A281.9

v59

1952 ANNUAL

VERMONT PMA CONFERENCE REPORT



Burlington, Vermont

April 24 - 25, 1952



REPORT OF ANNUAL PMA CONFERENCE

Vermont State and County Committeemen, Secretaries-Treasurers, County Agents, and Guests.

Held at Hotel Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, April 24 - 25, 1952

Foreword

The following report presents the highlights of our 1952 Annual Vermont PMA Conference. The two-day session brought out through its four committees those "grass roots" recommendations which will form the groundwork for the months ahead in the Vermont Production and Marketing Administration's program of work.

The recommendations included in the report are as they were approved by the entire conference. They will be later reviewed and considered by the Vermont State PMA Committee.

We feel that the 1952 Conference was one of the "good ones" because it was a working conference and the discussions contributed much in the way of good leadership and subject matter.

Furthermore, we felt highly honored this year in having Senator Ralph E. Flanders, Under Secretary of Agriculture C. J. McCormick, and H. L. Mawaring, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Production in PMA, with us to give of their knowledge, thinking and understanding.

We sincerely appreciate the efforts and wholehearted cooperation of all who helped in any way in contributing to the success of our 1952 PMA get-together.

State Committee

Leon N. Brainerd, Chairman
Thomas Macauley, Vice-Chairman
L. Earl Wilson, Member
Hugh E. Evans, Member
Edward K. Wright, Member

State Office

A. F. Heald, Executive Officer
Thomas H. Blow, Administrative Officer
E. N. Blondin, Fieldman
C. B. Doane, Fieldman

CONFERENCE THEME

Conserving and Mobilizing our
Agricultural Resources

We are proud of the part our 17 years of conservation work has had in building up our resources.

We should keep in mind throughout our conference ways and means of making better use of our PMA set-up in the mobilization effort. We want to cooperate with other agricultural agencies in mobilization and resources work.

We must strive to make our State, county, and community committeemen effective in administering these programs. We are resolved to do an outstanding job in 1952.

AGENDA

VERMONT PMA CONFERENCE

Thursday A.M.

April 24, 1952

9:00 A.M. to Register, get name tags and banquet
tickets at Conference Registration
10:00 A.M. Desk in Lobby

Conference Opened by Thomas F. Macauley, Presiding

10:00 A.M. Conference Goals
Introduction of delegates and visitors Leon N. Brainerd

10:15 A.M. The PMA Job Ahead H. L. Manwaring

11:30 A.M. Some suggestions for developing your
ACP Program Fred Ritchie

Discussion

11:45 A.M. Lunch

L. Earl Wilson, Presiding

1:00 P.M. Outline Procedure for State Committee
Nominations Thomas F. Macauley

1:15 P.M. Conference Committee Assignments Leon N. Brainerd

- A. Program Planning Committee
- B. Administrative Problems Committee
- C. Public Relations Committee
- D. Agricultural Mobilization Committee

1:30 P.M.
to
5:00 P.M. Conference Committee Meetings

* * * * *

SPECIAL PROGRAM FOR SECRETARIES-TREASURERS

Thursday P.M.

April 24, 1952

Mrs. Bertha D. Saunders, Presiding

1:30 P.M. Highlights of Radio Broadcasting "Dick" Burt,
Station WJO*

2:30 P.M.	Panel Discussion on Preparation of County News Letters	Mildred Murphy, Caledonia County PMA
		Louise Rand, Orange County PMA
		Mildred Bell, Essex County PMA
3:00 P.M.	Blue Cross Group Hospitalization Insurance	Paul Marsden, Representative, New Hampshire-Vermont Hospitalization Service
3:30 P.M.	General Discussion Session	Irene Abell, Marcia Tudhope, Bertha Saunders, State PMA Office

* * * * *

OUR CONFERENCE BANQUET

Thursday Evening

6:30 P.M.	Main Dining Room
<u>Toastmaster - J. E. Carrigan, Dean, College of Agriculture</u>	

PROGRAM

Maple Sugar Four

Presentation of Length of Service Awards

Macaulleys' 40th Wedding Anniversary

Clarence J. McCormick, Under Secretary of Agriculture

"Agriculture in a Changing World"

Senator Ralph H. Flanders

"Conservation As I See It"

Friday A.M.

April 25, 1952

Hugh E. Evans, Presiding

9:00 A.M.	Working Together on Conservation	
	Discussion led by	L. Earl Wilson
	Panel Members	L. J. Peet, State Conservationist
		Perry Merrill, State Forester
		R. P. Davison, County Agent Leader
		C. E. Cramton, President, Soil Conservation District Supervisors
10:00 A.M.	Current Events in Agricultural Mobilization	
	Discussion led by	A. F. Heald, PMA
	Selective Service	Major Merton Ashton, Assistant Director, Selective Service and R. P. Davison, Vermont Extension Service
	Farm Labor	E. Reynold Johnson and Merrill Walker, Vermont Employment Service
	Farm Prices	Thurston Adams, Extension Economist
11:00 A.M.	The Goals of the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee	Harris W. Soule, USDA Field Representative, New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee
11:45 A.M.	Lunch	

Edward K. Wright, Presiding

1:00 P.M.	Report of Committee on Program Planning	L. Earl Wilson, Chairman
	Discussion - Changes - Adoption	
1:30 P.M.	Report of Committee on Public Relations	E. K. Wright, Chairman
	Discussion - Changes - Adoption	
2:00 P.M.	Report of Committee on Administrative Problems	Hugh E. Evans, Chairman
	Discussion - Changes - Adoption	
2:30 P.M.	Report of Committee on Agricultural Mobilization	Thomas F. Macauley, Chairman
	Discussion - Changes - Adoption	
3:00 P.M.	Nominations for State Committee	Thomas F. Macauley
3:45 P.M.	Conference Summary	E. K. Wright
4:00 P.M.	Adjourn	

OPENING REMARKS

By Thomas F. Macauley, Vice-Chairman, Vermont PMA State Committee, at the Annual Vermont PMA Conference, Hotel Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, April 24, 1952.

Our Conference

In his opening remarks Mr. Macauley sounded the conference keynote as to the valuable contribution which the PMA program had made to Vermont agriculture during the period 1936 - 1952. He pointed out that if we were going to continue to hold the line against our soil losses and maintain our needs for production gains, then we would have to do even a better job of handling our conservation activities in the months and years ahead.

He urged and strongly recommended that Mr. Manwaring present every possible fact that he had available, particularly as they concerned what was to be required of farmer committeemen in carrying out the program most effectively at the grass roots level.

Mr. Brainerd, Chairman of the Vermont State PMA Committee reviewed the conference goals, introduced the conference delegates by counties and other guests from national, area, and State levels. He urged the participation of every individual attending the two days' discussion to give of their thinking both at the general sessions and in conference committees. "Only in this way can we have a successful conference," said Chairman Brainerd.



THE PMA JOB AHEAD

Summary of a recorded address by H. L. Manwaring, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Production, PMA, at Annual PMA Conference held in Burlington, Vermont, April 24 and 25, 1952.

I don't know what to say after an introduction like that one Mr. Macauley just gave. I don't know whether to dispute what he said, agree with it, or half and half. I am kind of like the Jewish preacher who came home all bushed one night and his wife said, "What's the matter?" And he said, "I'm tired out." She said, "Well, what did you speak on?" And he replied, "Well, I spoke on the subject that the rich should help the poor." And his wife said, "Did you convince the congregation?" And he said, "Well, I think I convinced half of them. I convinced the poor." I don't know whether to take half of that and discuss it, or the other half, or reminisce a little bit.

We could reminisce for a long time about the good old days. I remember the first time I went into New Hampshire. I believe it was almost the first meeting I ever attended in the Northeast. The boys were cussing the Triple A. Not just ordinary, you know, but this was a specific problem they had. They had gone ahead and operated on our recommendation to put superphosphate - acid phosphate, they called it at that time - on the land and they hadn't done a darned thing but make it more acid and just made it almost impossible to grow anything and they thought we were nuts. The Triple A, there sure was something wrong with it. Those were the days before Green Pastures and before things of that kind had been accomplished. I think we have come a long way since that time since the first days when we started up here. I remember another experience I had. One of the very first that I ever had in Triple A was a meeting held in Washington and at that meeting we called in the State Directors (I guess we called them Executive Officers) from all of the states in the Northeast Region to discuss the selection of county committeemen. I never was in such a hot meeting. The majority were opposed very definitely to the selection of county committeemen by election, and their reason was that you just couldn't expect to get county committeemen who could do a job of administering a program if you left it to that haphazard manner. There wasn't any way to do it except to select the leaders, and they knew them and there isn't any question but what they did select the leaders and let them run the program. We had it hot and heavy there that day. It was almost unanimous that you just could not elect county committeemen and expect a job to be done. Now they were not throwing stumbling blocks in the way of the program. That was their honest conviction and I suspect that many of the rest of us have felt the same way about it. Here was something brand new, something that had not been tried before, something that probably would not work, so why throw away something that had been tried for something that hadn't and expect it to work. Why take a chance when we had a sure thing. So, we have come a long way from that, I think, in the administration of programs and the acceptance of that idea of the election of county committeemen. Well, I could go on reminiscing for a long time because I have had a tremendous number of interesting, enlightening and educational experiences here in the Northeast and it seems good to get back and, I hope, renew friendships with you people that I had once before. I am reminded of (I guess it was Gray) and his Elegy in a Country Churchyard. He said, "Those friends thou hast as their adoption tried, bind to thy soul with bands of steel," or something to that effect. And so I hope I can do that again and that we can go away from here better friends, if that's possible, than we were before.

Those of us who are in Washington need a contact of this kind. However, we need it a little differently than this. We need to listen to you rather than your listening to us. We need to get a new perspective. We need to understand a little better what is going on out here and what changes have been made in agriculture - what the repercussions are - what we are now doing and what we ought to do to improve the programs, make them better and make the administration better. Our perspectives need to be improved and changed and worked on all the time.

You people have a heritage of rugged individualism and freedom and outspokenness. You have played a very great part in the making of the history of this country and it is good to get back and listen to people who will tell you what they think and who will do and act according to what they think, but who have their minds open to improvements, to progress, to a desire to do what is right and to improve themselves and their surroundings.

Now, I feel like the fellow who got up to make a speech one time and said he wished he had the voice of an angel so that he could impress people sufficiently so that they would believe and act. I almost wish that this morning, if that will do it. I don't know, but I have two objectives. Perhaps, I shouldn't tell you, If I don't tell you and you don't do what I say, then nobody can tell that I missed the objectives. If I do tell you, it might make it a little easier for you. I have two objectives, though. One of them is, if it is at all possible, to inspire you, and I am talking particularly to the county committeemen and to all the rest of you in agriculture, with the privilege you have of being the representative of the agricultural people of your State. And that goes whether you be PMA committeemen, or whether you be county agents, or whether you represent FHA, or SCS, or any other group of people in the State, because you do have a great privilege, if you have a part in not only continuing to build this country into a great nation but keeping it a have nation and keeping it a great nation. I want to talk particularly to the county committeemen because they and I are in the same organization and it is my responsibility to serve them as best I can and it is their responsibility to serve the farmer. That latter goes for all of us in agriculture and that's really our only excuse for existence in that we serve the farmers of our State and thus serve the nation to the best of our ability. And we can't separate those two. If we don't do that job, we haven't the slightest excuse for being around in agriculture. We need to be somewhere else, making brick or laying brick or doing something of that kind. So, if we aren't serving agriculture and doing a job, the best way we know how, we haven't any reason for being around - no objective.

In going back to this matter of election. Apparently, those who formulated the legislation that was passed by the Congress had some kind of vision because that hadn't been done. The administration of programs placed in farmers' hands, elected farmers, had not been done in any country and had not been tried. Maybe they just took a flying try at it and said, "Well, we have tried everything else, let's try this." But they must have had some kind of vision because it hadn't been tried before and it has proven to be a sound means of procedure, particularly on programs such as are administered by PMA. We have felt that great progress has been made and we feel that great progress can continue to be made and that we can go further in that than we have done before.

I am reminded of an anonymous poem. I don't know if it is even a poem, maybe just a statement. It was very interesting to me and I just happened to pick it up. Someone had given it to my little girl and it impressed me. It read, "A vision without a task is a dream. A task without a vision is a drudgery. A vision and a task is the hope of the world." When you get right down to it, you have all known this before and so have I, but I never happened to have anyone put it into words and lay it out so clearly. And I think that there was here with those men a vision. Then they went ahead and added to it a task and those of us who are working in the program, those of you who have been elected county committeemen and community committeemen, are now at that task. You are combining the vision and the task, not to make a dream or a drudgery, but to become the hope of the world. And I want to go into that in a minute.

Now I want to go back just a minute and say this - that the foundation of this program and its beginnings were in the Extension Service and were fostered by them and put on a sound foundation. We have much to thank the county agents, particularly in Vermont, for in doing that job. But I am again reminded of an experience I had when I was in Harris Soule's office one day when he was Executive Officer and I noticed a cartoon there. I believe it was cut off the front of a magazine and showed two monkeys trying to get a frog to jump through a hoop. One monkey the county agents had labeled "Benito Soule," I believe, and the other one "Adolph Varney." One of them was tickling the rear end of this frog with a feather and the other one was holding the hoop. I looked at the thing and inquired into its history and found that it originated at a county agents' conference where these "monkeys" were trying to put the county agent, with the label of the frog, through the PMA hoop or through the Triple A hoop. I don't know what truth there was in that, because I wasn't there, but they cooked it up and presented it to those two gentlemen after the meeting.

Interesting times, interesting progress - you can look back on that and we hope we are still, and I am sure we are, getting cooperation that the county agent gave at that time in starting the program on its way and giving it a boost. Without him, it wouldn't have gone, it couldn't have gone.

Now, those of you who are county committeemen have had a burden placed upon you which you have accepted and, whether you like it or not, you are going to have to submerge your own feelings and your own self to some extent in favor of the boys who elected you. You are the people's choice in your county. They looked around and said, "Let's elect him. He'll do the best job for this program and for us if we make him chairman." Apparently, some of you have fulfilled that obligation because you are still around. You are still the people's choice and you can take pride in that, it seems to me, because they have singled you out as being their representative. And, as I say, whether you like it or not, you will have to submerge your own feelings sometimes to represent the majority of the farmers in your county or in your area and to say what you think they want said, whether that quite agrees with what you think or not. Your alternative is, of course, to do something else.

You can back out if you don't like it, yet some of you have stayed around quite a long time because you are the people's choice. You have another privilege in addition to representing the people, and that is that you are in a position to run your own program. The Congress puts some limits on what you do in programs and the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator put some limits which they feel, after consulting all the people of the

country, are good for the entire program and are necessary, but they have said to you, "So far as we can, we want you to run your own program in your own county and we hope that you will run it well." It is an important thing. It's something that is not had in other countries. It's something that you should be proud of and that you should guard honestly as being sacred. You should regard it as being an important part of the agricultural part of this country and an important part of our entire organization and economy. There isn't anyone better qualified to do it than you are. There are a lot of people who think, "If I could only be county committeeman for a little while, I could really fix up that program in that county." Yet, you have the responsibility and you can do it best because many others have tried working out programs for counties at long distance and have found that they were just fine except that they didn't work. So, we depend on you to do that. Your farmers depend on you to administer and to formulate sound programs.

I don't know whether I told this before here or not, but I am reminded of Mr. Vance, who is Chairman of our Texas State Committee, and his experience in Greece. He went there on an economic mission representing agriculture and he went there to attempt to improve the agriculture of Greece, to help them lift themselves up by the bootstraps and become a have nation, a greater nation, agriculturally sound. He came back and said that it was almost an impossible task and the reason for it was that the people, the farmers themselves, whom they were trying to aid, had no responsibility whatever in the formulation or the administration of the program and had no say at all in what was done. Apparently, the effort was more to farm the farmer than to improve the agriculture. I heard a fellow accuse our own committee of that in Maine. He said, "You fellows are just farming the farmer. That's all you're doing." They had no responsibility - they had no know-how - they were given no authority, and he said, "Oh, that I could have had a committee system where the farmers themselves would make the decisions - where they knew the issues - and where they met the issues as best they could in their areas. We could have gone places. As it was, it was almost an impossible task." And so you have the privilege of running your own program.

Now, there are some people who think agriculture is the savior of the Nation. They will go that far. And I think it comes awfully close to that, too, which means that those of you who are working in agriculture, all of you, and those of you who have been elected by the farmers in your county to represent them, have a greater responsibility, a greater privilege, to lead the saviors of the Nation. I would like to quote for you from Daniel Webster who said, "Let us never forget that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man. When tillage begins, other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of civilization." Some fellow chiseled on the Union Station in Washington a similar statement and there is no one to attribute it to. It's on the front if you ever want to look at it. It reads, "The farm - best home of the family - main source of national wealth - foundation of civilized society - the national providence." It's really a broad statement and I don't know whether he was a farmer or not, but it's chiseled right on the stone on the front of the Union Station in Washington, D. C. There was another chap, however, who said, "Farming is the most senseless pursuit. A mere laboring in a circle. You sow that you may reap and then you reap that you may sow. Nothing ever comes of it." I just throw that in so that you won't feel that you are too important.

You do hold, according to many people, in your hands the fate of the Nation and there are many more who are beginning to recognize that. How you can read all the stuff in the papers, hear it on the radio, see it on television and think, "Oh Shucks, we can get along without agriculture because, after all, only 15% of the population of the country are farmers." But let them try it for a little while. You folks do have the privilege of holding in your hands the encouragement of abundant production for the American people. Maybe it's a corollary of what I just talked about or you can cut it off if you can get together enough to cut it off. But you have taken the responsibilities and assumed the task of feeding the people well. In fact, in times of adversity you have fed them better than they have ever been fed before. And now you have taken upon yourselves, or been given, the responsibility of attempting to work on the goals that have been set up. And those goals, incidentally, were checked with the people in the country as far as we could this year before they were sent out. Some of them we had to adjust after they came back. These goals were set up to get 6% more food and fibre for the people of the country than they had last year and 15% more feed grain - more than we have ever asked for in the history of this country. They have said to you - we would like you to give - and you people have the privilege of working on that problem for the people of the country and giving them of the largess of your farms and your labors.

I want to talk to you about that for just a minute. If we attain the complete goal that was set up, if you as farmers do everything that was asked of you, we still will not have enough food and fibre to meet the requirements of our domestic population, export to our allies and friends, fill the pipelines for the military and take care of any kind of a reasonable reserve. We still won't meet the goal or requirements. It would take 25 million more acres in this country to reach the requirements that are needed, not the goal we set up because it's less than we really ought to have. So we aren't quite meeting that goal. The BAE estimates that came out recently indicated that we were not going to reach the goal that was set up particularly with respect to feed for livestock. We have been trying to push that all over the country. I don't remember now, but I don't believe, even in your State where you have a small acreage of corn, that the estimates showed that you were going to meet your goal. I think it was short a little bit. Maybe that isn't so important for you, but, by adding just 15 acres more in a hundred to your corn acreage this year, at least the corn would be where it is used to a large extent and to that extent you wouldn't have to ship in more. Now we are not suggesting, and I am not suggesting, that you plow up good pastures and good haylands to do that. That would be just false economy, but, if you have some land that could go for that, I'd say go ahead and grow it on that acreage. Well, that again is your job and your privilege to work on that abundant production and adjust your farm operations to the needs of the day.

It is important, too, that we save our soil resources. This is a tremendous task, but we don't have to continue to mine our soils because we can use them and improve them at the same time.

Our population is increasing at the rate of 7400 people every 24 hours. This means that we will have 7400 more people to feed tomorrow than we have today and to feed this increase we will need $16\frac{1}{2}$ tons more food each day.

In producing this food, we will have to fight for a fair return to farmers. They will have to get a fair share of the consumer's dollar, a fair share of the National income and the advantages of civilization. It will be necessary, too, for farm people to fight their own battles because no one else will. There will be no hand-outs, but we do ask for an equal chance.

Responsibilities always go with privileges. It is necessary to formulate sound programs. They should not be selfish. In ACP, we have a new approach and people are beginning to understand the objectives better.

It is necessary to have efficient administration at the county level. Through ACP, the most possible conservation must be supplied for the money spent. There is also a responsibility to the farmer and it is necessary that we understand the reactions of the consumer and the Congress. It is important that people know what we are doing and why.

We have several tools to help do the job. These include such programs as the Agricultural Resources Conservation Program, the mobilization committees, help through price supports and the best cooperation possible with other agencies. The Secretary of Agriculture wishes each agency to administer its own programs yet be willing to help others.

In conclusion, I want to say that it is up to PMA to deliver the goods or others will take our place. Our past record is good, but we can't rest on our laurels. We must be ready for new jobs as they come and we must also remember that we are still losing ground. And so, to you I leave this thought:

"To each is given a box of tools,
A block of stone and book of rules.
Each must build, ere life is done
A stumbling block or stepping stone."

"We strive until the goal is gained,
Then reach for one still unattained,
For hope springs not from what we've done,
But from the job we've just begun."

SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR DEVELOPING YOUR ACP PROGRAM

Summary of comments made by Fred Ritchie, Assistant Director, ACP Branch, at Annual PMA Conference, Burlington, Vermont, April 24, 1952.

Note: Mr. Ritchie did not have a copy of his discussion available and being presently away from Washington was unable to make a complete digest available for this report.

Mr. Ritchie did, however, point out the need for strong soils and stated that farm people would learn through their committeemen being familiar with and carrying out their responsibilities. He felt it was very necessary for the farmer to make the most effective use of the practices available to his farm in 1953. He also urged that the committeeman and the farmer examine these practices very closely at the time of the farm visit.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Office of the Secretary

AGRICULTURE'S ROLE IN A CHANGING WORLD

Talk by Under Secretary of Agriculture Clarence J. McCormick at
State Conference of PMA Committeemen, Burlington, Vermont,
Thursday, April 24, 1952, 6:30 p.m., EST.

It's a real privilege to be here in Vermont visiting with fellow farmers.

It's always a pleasure to meet with people who have done so much to strengthen agriculture so it can play its full part in the affairs of the Nation, and of the world.

As an Indiana farmer, I know that you meet some farming problems that are different from the ones we have in the Midwest. On the other hand, I know that we have many things in common -- as farmers do all over the country.

One of the things we have in common is that we like to face up to problems squarely -- to figure out what the job is and then take hold of it with both hands and work it out. That's what agriculture has to do today -- to help meet the great changes that have taken place, and are taking place, in the world.

The world of today is restless and changing. This is sometimes called an air age -- or an atomic age. In agriculture, it's an age of mechanization -- of electrification -- of efficiency. But to all of us it's an age of change -- an age of challenge and a wonderful time to live.

In a few years we've seen vast improvements in science and technology, which can make life better for the world's millions. At the same time we've seen man greatly increase his power of self destruction.

We've seen the world get smaller and smaller -- airplanes and automobiles and good roads have made it shrink. But at the same time, we've seen sharp lines of division drawn between the free countries and those under totalitarian control.

(over)

And even those lines of division have shifted and changed. In a decade, we've seen the fall of one great combination of totalitarian powers, and the rise of another, as a world threat to peace and liberty. We have seen that threat turn to force in Korea.

We've seen many changes in agriculture in the past 20 years. We've seen a vast increase in agriculture's economic strength and in its productive power and efficiency. We've seen great progress in mechanization and electrification, conservation and research. Farmers have learned a lot about the value of cooperation in administering farm programs, and in strengthening their own ability to produce.

But there are people in this country who would turn back the clock on the progress agriculture has made.

At the very time when we have to have a strong agriculture -- when we have to have high production -- these people are trying to undermine the farmer by attacking our farm programs.

Who are these people? They're the same people who have fought these programs for 20 years. They've fought farmer cooperatives and farm electrification. They've fought price supports, our loan and storage programs, and credit programs for farmers. They've fought crop insurance and conservation programs. They've fought the farmer committee system which people like you have made so successful.

They've fought everything that made it possible for farmers to pull themselves out of the terrible plight they were in back in 1932.

They've fought every forward step that agriculture has made in the last 20 years -- every step of the way.

Some of these people give lip-service to agriculture but in their actions and their records the truth is plain to see. They are trying -- in renewed attacks -- to destroy our farm programs. They are trying to vindicate a 20-year record of obstructionism.

Where would we be today, if we had listened to such people before?

Where would we be today, if we hadn't had sound programs of farm credit to put agriculture firmly on its feet?

Where would we be today, if we didn't have electric power on our farms?

Where would we be today, if we hadn't made such progress in halting erosion and building up fertility of our soil?

Where would we be today, if farmers didn't have some assurance they wouldn't be penalized for increasing their production to meet the nation's emergency needs?

Where would we be today, if we didn't have extension service programs carrying directly to farmers the new and improved methods developed by research?

And let me add just one more question:

Where will we be tomorrow -- what will the Nation's food supply be tomorrow -- if we listen to the people today who would take from farmers these programs that are contributing so much to the vitality and strength of American agriculture?

Our agriculture has faced many challenges, and never yet been found wanting. Today's changing world places new challenges before agriculture.

What is agriculture's role in the Nation's over-all effort?

Agriculture's first duty is to produce. We must produce enough for our military needs. We must produce enough to maintain at a high level the health and vigor of a growing civilian population. We must produce enough to build up needed reserves. We must produce enough so that we can provide emergency help to friendly countries that are fighting communism.

The farmers of this country have set tremendous production records in the past decade. Even last year -- despite drought and floods which caused 26 million acres of planted crops to be abandoned -- we harvested near-record production.

This year we've got to do even better. We've got to produce feed, food, and fiber as never before. The farm goals for 1952 call for at least 6 percent more over-all output than we had last year -- on substantially the same acreage. That's a goal nearly one-half greater than the prewar production, and it's a big order. But that is a minimum goal not a maximum.

(over)

But here's the situation we're facing: We have been consuming more than we are producing, eating out of our reserves. The so-called "surplus stocks" some folks were worrying about not too long ago are either gone or fast going -- too fast for comfort.

We're especially concerned about feed grains. Our reserve stocks of feed grains have dwindled below a safe level. We in the Department of Agriculture are doing everything we can to encourage and assist farmers to raise more feed grains this year -- especially corn.

That's what we need this year -- a new all-time high in farm production.

Now let's look a little farther ahead. That means we've got to take stock of our growth in population.

Our population has been increasing at a rate of about $2\frac{1}{2}$ million a year -- $2\frac{1}{2}$ million new customers for the farmer each year, 7,400 a day, 300 an hour, five every minute.

Even allowing for some slackening in this rate of increase, we're likely to have 190 million people in this country by 1975. That's a gain of one-fourth.

Now what does this mean for the farmer -- and for the Nation? It means that for every four people who sat down to a meal in 1950, there will be another person at the table in 1975.

There will be a fifth plate to be filled -- and it will have to be filled three times a day, 365 days a year.

It is natural to ask: Will the fifth person's plate be filled by the other four dividing up their portions? Or, will farmers increase food production rapidly enough so the fifth plate can be filled from the kitchen without cutting down on the other portions?

How much more food will it take? Let me give you a few examples.

To supply each person in 1975 with the same standard of diet as we have been getting would require about $5\frac{1}{2}$ billion more pounds of the red meats than were produced in 1950.

We would need 10 billion more quarts of milk -- equal to the 1950 milk production of Wisconsin, Michigan, and New York.

We would need an additional $1\frac{1}{4}$ billion dozen eggs -- equal to the 1950 egg production of California, Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, and Pennsylvania.

These figures don't allow for better diets. It provides just for holding our own. All of us hope that by 1975 our standard of diet can be improved. To do this we would need a great deal more meat, milk, and eggs than the increases I just mentioned.

Now what about total production, including fibers and the other big export crops?

A fairly conservative estimate is that the production of all farm commodities will have to rise a little more than 20 percent above the 1950 level to supply each person in 1975 with as much as we have been getting.

The point is this: We've been producing at record levels in recent years to fill normal demand and emergency needs. But it won't be long before we will need to produce more than is being produced now to fill our normal needs alone.

Agriculture's second duty in the Nation's over-all defense effort is closely related to what we've been talking about. It's conservation. We've got to get record production without abusing the land or injuring its ability to produce for the future. We've got to plan for the long haul.

That means we've got to push hard for grasslands. Grasslands farming is productive farming. It's conservation farming. It's economical farming.

(over)

We need to emphasize pasture improvement all over the country, including Vermont. We need to increase feed and forage from all our grasslands by planting high-yielding types of hay and legume and grass mixtures. We need to make our lime and phosphate pay off in increased forage.

There are almost a billion acres of permanent grasslands in this country -- mostly unimproved. Farmers can double or triple production on hundreds of millions of acres of these grasslands through liming, fertilization, reseeding with more productive grasses and legumes, and good management. Here in the Northeast, pasture renovation has resulted in four to six times more forage production.

So, there you have agriculture's two-fold job in the Nation's over-all effort.

First, we've got to gear for record production this year and increasing production in the future.

Second, we must practice conservation farming, so that we can maintain and increase yields for high production in future years.

It's a big job that agriculture is being asked to do. It's the biggest job the farmers of this country have ever been asked to do. It may be the most important -- although no one knows what might already have happened to the world had it not been for our record production of the past decade.

But I'm sure we've got the team in agriculture today to do that job.

It's a team that was built in a time of adversity, and became a mainstay to its country in time of great crisis. What would we have done in World War II if we hadn't had its strength? What would happen if the Nation's agriculture of 1932 were asked to do what we're asking of the Nation's agriculture in 1952?

The team I'm talking about is, of course, the farmers themselves, their farmer committees, and their Government.

Take the farmers.

Last year the net income of farm operators was nine times the dollar income per farm operator in 1932. In terms of purchasing power, farm income per operator was about four times as great as in 1932.

Farm foreclosures in 1950 averaged less than three per day -- over the entire country. Twenty years ago foreclosures averaged one every eight minutes -- day and night, week days and Sundays. Many of us remember those days -- vividly.

These facts indicate the great economic advance American farmers have made. But they don't by any means tell the whole story of agricultural progress.

Today only 15 percent of our population is on farms, and less than one-eighth of our labor force is employed in agriculture. Yet we are producing at least two-fifths more food and fiber than we did when one-fourth of our people were on farms.

Farmers are offsetting a smaller labor force by using more fertilizer, more insecticides and fungicides. They're planting better varieties and doing a better job of breeding and feeding livestock. They've mechanized their farm plants and modernized many of their operations through greater application of electricity to farm tasks.

And -- very important -- they're learning to farm the "conservation way," to use their land, forests, and water resources wisely.

Last year the Nation's population was 22 million persons larger than in 1940, while farm population was nearly 6 million smaller than in 1940. Yet the American people consumed per person 7 percent more food in 1951 than they did 11 years earlier. Besides, we sent a lot of food abroad and diverted a good deal to military consumption.

Yes, farmers have made tremendous progress in the past 20 years, and they've done it through teamwork. It is through committeemen like you that farmers all over the country have been able to cooperate in making agriculture sounder and more prosperous.

I firmly believe that the system of freely elected farmer committeemen that is represented here today is an example of economic democracy which no other country, and indeed no other branch of American industry, can equal.

You are the men who are called upon to spark plug the production goal drives and the farm scrap campaigns. You administer the price support programs in the counties and communities. You encourage your neighbors to improve and maintain their soil resources. You are the direct pipeline that leads from the grassroots to the seat of government in Washington -- and it is along this pipeline that suggestion, criticisms, and approval of prospective programs and policies are continually flowing back and forth.

I realize that you know all these things. But I think you need to know that we too realize how important you are in the agricultural picture.

Nowhere has the principle of farmer participation in administering farm programs been more successful than in PMA. But farmer participation is also important in guiding work of the Farmers Home Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Extension Service, the Agricultural Research Administration, the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. Each makes vital use of farmers, whether in advisory boards or in groups providing supervision to local operations.

What could be more in keeping with the fundamental American concept of democracy?

This system of farmer participation in the administration of farm programs has been -- I am confident -- a very real factor in the amazing progress of our agriculture during the past 15 or 20 years.

I'm proud that the Department of Agriculture and its employees are also part of this Nation's agricultural team. I'm very proud of the Department's programs and the people who make them go.

I think we're all proud of our democratic government. We hold it forth as an example to the world. When we look at the troubled history of other governments, we have every right to be proud.

Yet we have a strange habit. We boast about our Government all right -- but at the same time, the people who make the Government go are the victims of barrage after barrage of criticism.

If our Government deserves praise, the people who make it work -- day in and day out -- have a right to share in that praise. Instead they have to dodge brickbats.

It takes more than buildings, equipment, and words on paper to make a successful government. It takes sincere people, devoted to the ideals upon which the government is created.

We occasionally hear a great uproar about isolated cases of human frailty in government. Yet little is said in appreciation of the thousands of career employees and of people like yourselves, loyally and efficiently carrying on assigned work without ever bringing discredit upon themselves, their fellow workers, or their government.

People should think about that before making loose accusations in generalized terms.

The Department of Agriculture today is giving more services with proportionately fewer dollars and fewer employees than ever before.

Let the facts speak for themselves: The Department is now carrying on most of the functions it had in 1940, plus all of those added since -- the Rural Telephone program, the Farm Housing program, the Research and Marketing Act, the Point Four program overseas, and all of our Defense responsibilities.

Now compare our budget: In 1940, it was 1.6 billion dollars. For the fiscal year 1952, it is 1.3 billion. In 1940 the Agriculture budget's per capita cost to

(over)

the people of this country was \$12.44 a year. It's now about \$8.00 a year -- or a little over 2 cents a day. Is it not worth 2 cents a day per person for the Nation to be assured of an adequate food supply?

Compare the number of employees: In 1940, we had 71 thousand full-time workers in the Department. We have about 56 thousand now. In fact, only 2.2 percent of all full-time Federal employees work for the Department of Agriculture.

Yet the Department is recklessly accused of being a mammoth, sprawling outfit that is full of duplication of effort, and lacking in direction. We so often hear charges about "big government," about a "vast bureaucracy," and deliberate centralization of authority in Washington.

Your committees are living proof that we have been moving in the opposite direction from government centralization in carrying out the farm programs. And the great success with which you have voluntarily directed the various farm program operations for the benefit of your own State and communities proves the worth of the farmer committee system.

With this kind of cooperation I'm sure agriculture's team can do the job that's ahead. But let me sound a note of warning.

We cannot do it by limiting our research activities. We cannot do it by weakening our conservation efforts. We cannot do it by tightening down our credit services. We cannot do it by weakening our price support structure -- and thereby telling farmers that if they expand production they do so at their own risk.

The programs which have done so much to build the productive power of agriculture must be continued -- and improved and strengthened.

Farmers must have adequate price protection if they are to be able to respond to their country's call for greater and greater output. Farmers know that increased production is the answer to greater security and higher living standards for themselves and for the Nation. But they certainly are entitled to know they

won't be seriously penalized for expanding production in answer to the Nation's need.

Farmers must also have help in conservation -- and I'm sure any thoughtful person will readily agree that the rest of the Nation has a stake in getting conservation practices followed on our farms. And it's a mighty big stake -- the assurance of an adequate food supply for our growing population -- through building up soil fertility to increase yields.

Experience has shown that it isn't enough to develop sound conservation measures, and simply tell people they should use these practices. We know that American farmers -- you and I and the rest of us -- went on farming for a long, long time, doing little or nothing to stop soil erosion and deterioration.

Farmers need expert technical help for conservation planning and land treatment. They often need some financial assistance also to carry out conservation work needed immediately -- or to develop permanent conservation measures such as terraces.

The ACP payments help to bridge the gap between farmers wanting to make use of conservation practices which research and education have brought to them, and their ability and willingness to do the work without costly delays.

Suppose, for example, that as a result of neglect of land resources and consequent decline in production, the cost of all our domestically produced food was increased just one cent a pound. This one cent a pound increase for the food consumed by our 156 million people would amount to \$2,418,000⁰⁰ a year -- 10 times the cost of ACP.

The meaning of these farm programs in terms of better living for all is too often overlooked. That brings up another point I want to make, and it's this:

(over)

To fill the Nation's big production order, farmers need -- and are certainly entitled to -- the cooperation and the understanding of all other groups in their communities -- workers, businessmen, all consumers, all segments of the economy.

There is too much misunderstanding of our farm programs and the farmer's problems. Take price supports, for instance. These programs serve an important purpose, but I think it is worth pointing out to people who are confused by such programs that price supports do not even assure farmers of a parity relationship with non-farm groups. Much less do they guarantee them "profits in hand." They merely prevent prices from collapsing below a percentage of parity.

Many people do not seem to understand the many ways in which price supports benefit not only farmers, but the whole Nation. They help prevent the weakening of the national economy by protecting against collapses of farm prices. They stabilize supplies for the benefit of consumers. They provide increased farmer buying power, which is reflected in business profits.

Price supports make it possible for farmers to produce abundantly -- without fear of a total market collapse. That's of great significance to consumers of agricultural products. Many times that means large supplies at reasonable prices -- when otherwise there might be scarcity and high prices.

This year, for instance, we are asking for increased production of corn and other feed grains. We hope and believe that farmers will meet the goals; this grain is badly needed to avoid a serious situation in our feed grain supplies.

And if farmers do meet these feed grain goals, one of the factors making it possible will be the price support program. Farmers can do their very best to expand corn acreage and increase yields, without the fear that they will be made to suffer for their own diligence -- through a collapse in prices.

That fact is of great importance, for instance, to Vermont livestock and poultry producers and dairymen who depend on feed grain that is shipped in. And

it's of great importance to the consumers of livestock and poultry products everywhere. It's one of the ways that price supports work to the benefit of consumers.

It's a team job that we have ahead of us in agriculture. It will require the cooperation of farmers, you farmer committeemen, and all the state and Federal agencies concerned with agriculture. And it will require the support and understanding of other groups which are outside agriculture -- but which have an equal stake in farm production and an equal stake in the conservation of our resources for future production.

What is the challenge facing agriculture, and how do we meet it?

Production -- enough for our military needs -- enough for a growing civilian population -- enough to build up needed reserves -- enough to provide emergency help to friendly foreign countries.

Conservation -- to get more and more production -- to meet greater and greater needs in the future.

That's agriculture's role in a Nation dedicated to peace.

That's agriculture's role in a changing world.

#

CONSERVATION AS I SEE IT

Summary of comments made by Senator Ralph E. Flanders at Annual PMA Banquet, Burlington, Vermont, April 24, 1952.

Note: Senator Ralph E. Flanders advised us that he did not have a copy of his talk available, but the following remarks taken during his commentary are herewith included.

"Soil conservation affects everybody and through conservation practices our landscape has changed." To illustrate this point, Senator Flanders told of observations he had made from a plane while flying over some of our mid-western states. "It was very noticeable," he said, "that grass-land had replaced erosion and that gullies had been controlled. Likewise, the growing of legumes has increased the need for lime and fertilizers in the northeast." In closing, Senator Flanders pointed out that Vermont farms continue to produce because their operators have practiced good conservation farming.

WORKING TOGETHER ON CONSERVATION*

by

L. J. Peet, Vermont State Conservationist

On February 15, 1951 the Secretary issued Memo 1278. Its purpose was to coordinate more closely the agricultural resources conservation activities of the Department. Steps to be taken to do this were outlined in the memo. As a consequence we in SCS were told to take responsibility for the technical phases of certain ^{permanent} type practices in your program. We were told also to participate in formulating and determining the soil conservation policies and programs for the State and for each county. I want to talk first about the carrying out of these responsibilities.

My interpretation of the responsibilities just mentioned is this. For permanent type practices other than forestry, we are responsible for writing practice specifications. In so doing we will work with you to the end that they will be satisfactory to you as well as us. We will also determine the need for and practicability of such practices on a particular farm, give the technical help required for proper installation, and certify performance. Procedures for handling these technical responsibilities have been worked out and are in operation.

Our responsibilities for program formulation and determination seem to me should take the form of recommendations which you are free to accept or reject. You are responsible for your program and should make the final determinations.

To a large extent the things I have mentioned we were previously doing informally. Formalizing what we were doing does have this effect: We take the job more seriously. I know I have tried to get a better picture and understanding of your program this year than in years past.

In trying to get a better picture and piece together various comments I have heard, it seems to me there are several program questions that deserve your consideration. They don't necessarily mean you should change your program, but I think you should be in agreement on the answers and prepared to answer them should they be asked, as they may well be.

Question 1. Should all practices in the program be given the same emphasis and priority?

Different practices serve different purposes and give different results. Some annual practices, such as fertilizer, contribute a maximum amount immediately to production and farm returns, but with relatively short-time benefits as indicated by need for continued annual applications indefinitely. Many permanent practices are more in the nature of long-term improvements with small annual returns. A few, such as riprap, may yield direct benefits to others than the farmer who does the work. In the past you have emphasized lime and fertilizer - practices yielding high immediate returns.

Question 2. Do farm allowances based largely on animal units best reflect the needs of the land?

Roughly, three-fourths of the farm allowance in some counties is based on animal units. This makes the size of farm allowances on most farms related directly to number of cows; size of farm business and to a considerable extent farm income but perhaps not to land needs.

Question 3. Is the priority given to lime and fertilizer by the method used in establishing farm allowances desirable?

Farm allowances have been based on quantities of lime needed and quantities of fertilizer allowed according to animal units. The tendency under this system is to encourage use of the farm allowance for lime and fertilizer and to encourage other practices when the farm allowance is not used for fertilizer or there is a likelihood additional funds will be available later.

Question 4. Is the system of payments for practices as equitable as possible?

Now, farmers who get furnished materials have to put up their money in advance but only for about 1/2 the total cost of the materials. Farmers who carry out cash practices must finance their entire cost and wait usually for several months before receiving payment.

The answers to these questions depend in good part on the emphasis you want to put on lime and fertilizer. Historically you have put emphasis on these practices. Your program is still shaped to do so. I am not saying it is wrong. A few years ago I recommended to the State Committee that the program be limited to lime and fertilizer. There is still need for more of these materials than we are using. Limiting the program to them would simplify administration. Farmers, I think, would be quite satisfied. Furthermore, it is not clear how much payments have increased permanent type practices. Amounts done have not increased sharply since payments were started, but neither has farm income been as favorable. Also, farmers have had to finance the entire cost, knowing that payment would not be received for some time and in some cases at least that the payment would depend upon funds later determined to be available.

In spite of what I have just said, it is the thinking in Washington, and I think it may well be in the interest of your program in the long run, to use your funds as wisely as possible in meeting most needed conservation practices on each farm rather than trying to limit your program to lime and fertilizer. If this be so, I think it is in your interest to carefully consider the questions I have mentioned.

So much for program development. I would like next to say something about the problems involved in carrying out our responsibilities for certain permanent type practices. Here may be an opportunity for both of us to improve substantially over what we have been doing, in spite of the great improvements that have been made during the past year.

This past year the plan was for you to get to us as many of the permanent practice requests as possible by November 1 so that we could determine practicability and feasibility of the practices before winter. We did get many, but not all, and we were hampered by an early winter. From our standpoint we could work more efficiently if we could get the requests about October 1. We could then work them in with our fall follow-up work and got at least the bulk of them finished by January 1. This would require an earlier sign-up date. The completion of our work by January 1, however, might considerably help you in encumbering your funds and planning for their best use. Anything you can do to get the requests to us as early as possible will be appreciated. We in turn will do everything we can to get them back to you by January 1. This might also facilitate an earlier closing date for your sign-up which, in turn, would help us in planning the use of our resources.

It has been said before, but I would like to re-emphasize, that care in signing up farmers for permanent type practices saves us a lot of time. I expect it also simplifies your work. It is important in signing up farmers for permanent type practices not only to make sure that they really intend to carry them out during the year, but also that what the farmer has in mind meets the practice description. A good many of the practices farmers sign up for don't meet practice descriptions. A better job is done in sign-up in some counties than in others. Any way we can help on this problem, we will.

This year we are not getting the sheets back from you with definite amounts allotted for various jobs very fast. The earlier you can get them back, the better job we can do in using our resources. We in turn will do what we can to promptly certify work done, although that is not always feasible.

The whole system is sufficiently involved to require a good deal of teamwork and coordination to do a really effective job. I believe, however, the time and effort put on it will be very worthwhile for us both.

I have talked so far about our participation in your program. What about your participation in our program? Well, we furnish mainly the personal services of persons employed to help land owners get a sound job of conservation applied on the land. When, where and priority of use of our services - the things with which programs are usually concerned - are the responsibility of District Supervisors. In effect we carry out a part of the District program. The matter, therefore, is largely one of your participation in the District program. I do not mean, however, that we would turn down any help we could get in improving our technical standards or the methods of applying them - the things with which we are mainly concerned in our program.

Actual participation in one another's program - the things I have been talking about - perhaps offers the greatest opportunities for effectively working together, also for getting into trouble with one another. So far I think we have pretty well taken advantage of the opportunities and avoided the pitfalls.

Another method of achieving coordination is to get together and, through discussion, develop a common thinking and approach to conservation problems. The ARC provides a medium for this. I have been surprised both at the area of agreement reached in some counties and in the differences in thinking and approach brought out in others. The ironing out of these differences requires tolerance, a good deal of time and hard work, and able leadership. Success, however, is well worth the effort. I hope that County ARC groups continue to get together occasionally to further and maintain a common approach to agricultural resources conservation and to keep each other advised of progress and program developments.

So far I have talked only about things that we have been directed to do as a result of actions taken in Washington. An entirely different approach is that of voluntarily tying together our efforts at those spots where it would be helpful from the over-all conservation standpoint. There are many such opportunities, but their realization is dependent entirely upon their being seen and appreciated by the representatives of the agencies concerned. The better understanding we have of the agricultural resources conservation job and the more nearly we have a common approach for dealing with conservation problems, the more likelihood a voluntary tying together of our efforts will occur.

The panel chairman has asked, "How can ACP committeemen help farmers make better use of existing plans in connection with ACP work?" For those farmers who are District cooperators and have a farm conservation plan, I suggest that the committeemen know and discuss with the farmer those practices in the ACP Program included in the conservation plan but not yet established. Such information might be gotten from our records and taken to the farm by the committeeman. In the process of such discussion there might be need for the farmer to get out his plan to answer questions raised. I question that it would, as a rule, be practical to get committeemen to ask farmers for their farm conservation plan and then discuss with the farmer what has been done and what remains. It would take more time than I think the committeeman would want to spend. However, I think committeemen should be familiar with the plans by having one themselves or through training meetings.

I think committeemen might well encourage farmers to keep a record by fields of the treatment and use of each field each year. In such discussions the use of farm conservation plans as a basis for keeping this information by field numbers or on a tracing made from the revised land use map might well be discussed. This would contribute toward the use of farm conservation plans by farmers.

I, personally, am very pleased with the progress we have made. I think we have good working relationships. Problems will continually arise, but I believe we have the ability to work them out.

WORKING TOGETHER ON CONSERVATION

Note: At the time of preparing this report a complete digest of the comments made by Perry Merrill, State Forester, had not been received.

However, Mr. Merrill pointed out to the conference group how the various forestry services available from his department tied in with the needs for getting the most possible from ACP practices.

WORKING TOGETHER ON CONSERVATION

Summary of comments made by R. P. Davison, County Agent Leader, Vermont Extension Service, at PMA Conference, Friday, April 25, 1952.

The Extension Service has for nearly all of its thirty-eight years promoted conservation. Back twenty-five years ago it worked closely with the Vermont Commission on Country Life in helping to get folks to talk and think about conservation and other problems themselves. The results of that work, which were published in a book called "Vermont by Two Hundred Vermonters" indicated some interesting things that may be repeated for what they are worth here to day. These included recommendations calling for 500,000 tons of lime per year on Vermont farms if liming to neutrality was accomplished. (2) A recommendation was made that the cost of lime should be decreased by getting bulk handling and delivery. (3) Superphosphate in the gutter was strongly recommended. The rate of 200 pounds per acre was felt to be okay at that time. (4) Sweet clover was recommended to replace soiling crops for early fall pasture. (5) A great deal of emphasis was placed on land use, especially the relationship of pasture land, woodland, and meadow land on farms.

The Extension Service was the first to pave the way through educational meetings and early structural organization for the Agricultural Conservation Program in Vermont. County agents, Harris Soule - then county agent leader, and Joe Carrigan - Director of the Extension Service, all worked hard in setting up the community and county and state committeemen system, and in helping to organize the counties in connection with this work. As the years have gone along the ACP Organization has been able to carry on much of the work itself. The county agents and the director still remain as ex-officio members of the respective committees.

The same was done for S.C.S. districts by county agents and state leaders. Early educational work on the Winooski demonstration area was instrumental in creating interest in soil conservation district work, and later county agents were very helpful in interesting farmers in actually organizing S.C.S. Districts in the thirteen areas of the state.

Conservation is an always continuing job. Great strides have been made since 1910 - '14 in this field. These include: (a) much better protection of our natural land, water, and forests, (b) greater yields per acre and better care of the soil, (c) a much wiser land use, both from an economic standpoint and from a physical use standpoint.

Now we are faced with an ever increasing population as we have been for the past century. This increasing population calls for a continued wise use of our soil or else we may burn it out in trying to do our job of increasing food production. We can do this job of increased food production and still keep our land in tip-top condition if we continue our educational efforts toward these ends.

The Extension Service will continue to carry out sound education information in this whole field just as they have done in the past. It will help to keep farmers making a wise use of their land and natural resources, and at the same time a wise use of their action programs gunned toward soil conservation.

Since county agents are ex-officio members of county A.C.P. Committees, and Dean Carrigan is ex-officio member of the State A.C.P. Committee, we will continue to assist with meetings where the program is developed. It may be that county agents will have to attend fewer meetings where other matters are considered, but they will always be willing and should be asked to attend meetings where policy and programs are developed. I hope that committeemen will realize this fact and will arrange their meetings so that best use of the time of the county agent can be made. His advice will be valuable in connection with program development.

The Extension Service and the College will continue to maintain the soil testing and recommendation service as they have for many years in the past.

We will continue to release publicity about the program by press and radio as in accordance with already existing agreements between the Extension Service Editor and the FMA Executive Officer, and between county agents and county committees.

Agricultural specialists will continue to serve on A.C.P. Technical Advisory Committees as requested.

Finally, the Extension Service will continue to carry out an overall general educational program dealing with soil conservation matters, parts of which may be strengthened by the A.C.P. through its furnished materials and services program.

WORKING TOGETHER ON CONSERVATION

Summary of comments made by C. E. Cramton, President, Soil Conservation District Supervisors, at PMA Conference, Friday, April 25, 1952.

As I See It

The folks of both PMA and SCS have worked closely and well on the overall soil and agricultural conservation job being carried out in Vermont. This is as it should be.

We have found in our district work that farmers like to be shown rather than just told how to do things. With this in mind, I feel that demonstration farms which show a complete farm conservation job would be very helpful.

Within our SCS set-up, we are limited as to equipment and this means that several of the farm jobs requested are slow in getting completed.

I feel it would speed up the work, both requested and accomplished, if it could be made possible for the farmer to get his payment for permanent type practices upon completion of the job. The farmer just doesn't like having to wait too long for his money.

In summary, I want to say that we must continue with conservation work and do a better job with some of the tools we now have if we are going to save our grasslands here in Vermont.

DISCUSSION PANEL ON AGRICULTURAL MOBILIZATION

Introduction given by A. F. Heald, Executive Officer, at
the PMA Conference Friday, April 25

I know that this group is very vitally interested in the part agriculture can play in the overall mobilization job of this country. To assist county chairmen particularly and to give a working background for all of us who are working on this job of agricultural mobilization, we have arranged for a discussion panel here at your annual conference. Some of the most vital things that affect us here in Vermont are farm labor supplies, our relationships with Selective Service and the agricultural price situation, so the people selected to be with us are experts on those respective subjects.

Once again I want to remind you that the job on agricultural mobilization has to be done at the county, community and farm levels. It can't be done at the State Office or the Washington Office. Sure, we can help with the planning, we can help get you information and we can help pass the information which you give us on to the Washington Office, but the real work and the real success or failure of the program rest out there in the field.

I expect that sometimes the county mobilization committee members and the chairmen have asked the question, "Is the work of mobilization committees important?" The fact is that State members have also asked themselves that question. On April 3, we arranged to meet in Burlington with the Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan, who of course is Chairman of the National Mobilization Committee, and we asked him that question. His answer was, "Yes. State and county mobilization committees are important." He went on to explain that the facts that they have presented to him as Chairman of the National Committee and Secretary of Agriculture have enabled him to fight for the things that agriculture needs. They have helped him and his coworkers properly plan for the amount of fertilizer that was needed, the amount of lime that was needed, and the machinery and farm labor that was needed. They have helped him in working out relationships at the National level with Selective Service. When he meets with the heads of various groups, he has facts which have been collected by county and state mobilization committees to present to them. He doesn't have to give them a lot of guesses made in the Washington Office. Our discussion with the Secretary kind of peped us up for the work that we are doing and it made us stop and think and realize that many of the things that we are doing are important and if we didn't get them done, no one else would. In other words, this agricultural mobilization job that we are doing can be a lot of assistance to the farmers in the State of Vermont. It is up to us to do the job and do it well.

I want to urge each and every one of you members of the county mobilization committees to get the facts on the jobs which are assigned to you. Just don't leave them for someone else to do. Make your assignments in your mobilization committees and then follow through to make sure that everything possible is being done to see that the assignments are carried out in their entirety. Get your reports in as they are required. Keep us informed of the problems. Ask us when you need help. If we all work on this thing together, we will have done the job that is assigned to us.

With this introduction, I will now go into our panel discussion.

HIGHLIGHTS OF AMENDMENTS TO SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW
(Effective June 19, 1951)

Summary of comments made by Merton E. Ashton, Assistant Director of the Vermont Selective Service, at PMA Annual Conference, Friday, April 25, 1952.

1. Change of Title, "Universal Military Training and Service Act, As Amended."
2. Change of age for classification and liability for service; classification from 19 to 18 or on date of registration. For liability of service from 19 to 18 and 6 months.
3. Change of induction standards. Physical acceptability as of January 1945 for 18 to 26 year olds. Mental (AFQT) from 13 to 10.
4. At least 4 months' training for inductees prior to use outside of United States.
5. Change in length of service from 21 months to 24 months.
6. Any male inducted, enlisted or appointed who serves less than 3 years shall be transferred to the reserve component if he meets requirements and shall remain a member thereof for a period of 5 years. Total of 8 years for all inducted and enlisted or appointed prior or subsequent to date of enactment.
7. Males under 19 years of age shall not be inducted prior to men who are 19 or over or men 18 plus 8 months shall not be inducted prior to men who are 90 days older.
8. Organized unit reservists as of February 1, 1951 are exempt from service as long as they serve satisfactorily.
9. Any person who is deferred for occupations, dependency or fitness shall remain liable for service and training until the 35th anniversary of their birth.
10. Dependency deferments are provided for other than wives alone except in cases of extreme hardship.
11. No local board or appeal board shall be required to defer or postpone any person by reason of activity in study or research solely on the basis of a test or scholastic standing.
12. Any person who is satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or college, shall upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (a statutory deferment, not postponed). But any person who has previously been postponed or deferred as a college student shall not be entitled to a further statutory deferment.
13. Any person who enlisted or was inducted or was appointed subsequent to June 24, 1948 and serves not more than 4 years shall be entitled upon release under honorable conditions to reemployment rights.
14. Any person who is rejected on induction shall be entitled to reemployment rights.

MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE'S SELECTIVE SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Summary of comments made by R. P. Davison, County Agent Leader, Vermont Extension Service, at PMA Conference, Friday, April 25, 1952.

The new Selective Service Memorandum 13 as revised in February calls for closer cooperation between local Selective Service Boards and County Mobilization Committees. It is my feeling that this memo will only tend to put into writing what we have already been doing in Vermont for the last year or so. Our relations with Selective Service Boards have been excellent. In many counties, Selective Service Boards and Mobilization Committees have met jointly and they certainly have a good understanding relative to the drafting of young men from farms.

In light of this new memorandum, it is suggested that local county Mobilization Committees make an effort to have a joint meeting with their local Selective Service Boards in the near future to, first, review the memorandum, and then to review the current agricultural labor situation in the county, and to review any new developments that concern the local Selective Service Boards. Such a meeting once a year should prove to be a good way to keep all parties concerned currently informed.

County Mobilization Committees have a definite job in connection with Selective Service activities to the end that they keep all young men working on farms informed relative to any changes in Selective Service relations that may affect them, the necessity for keeping the local board currently informed at all times relative to any changes in their status, and the necessity for putting all the information that is available about the registrant in his file, so that the Selective Service Board will have the best information possible to work on when considering the case.

There have been a few cases so far of so-called farm jumpers. These have been dealt with fairly by Selective Service Boards, and in general it is our feeling that the Selective Service Boards in the State are doing an all around good job in connection with the deferment of farm boys and farm workers here in the State. If Mobilization Committees continue to keep their Selective Service Boards informed relative to agricultural conditions, and cooperate with them as well as they have in the past, this part of the manpower problem in the State should be adequately taken care of.

Summary of Comments Made by
Mr. E. Reynold Johnson, Director
and Mr. Merrill B. Walker, Farm
Placement Supervisor, of the
Vermont State Employment Service
Division of the Unemployment
Compensation Commission

FMA Conference - Friday, April 25, 1952

Farm Labor Problem

Farm labor from present indications will be scarcer than at any time since World War II. Farm labor openings on file in local employment offices number 376 of which 274 are filled by Canadian workers. This compares with 128 Canadians employed one year ago and 318 Canadians employed at the July-August 1951 harvest peak.

Non-agricultural employment is running ahead of a year ago and if it were not for textile unemployment would probably be near an all-time peak.

Non-agricultural wages in relation to prevailing farm wages are the primary bar to interesting new workers in farm work.

Action Taken to Alleviate Shortage

1. Employment Service counselors working with majority of high schools in the State are pushing agricultural work, especially for harvest months. Results not too good except for farm youth who are already committed to family farms.
2. Vermont Farm Volunteer Program being emphasized to bring larger number of out-of-State school youth into State for summer work.
3. Attempts are being made to interest selected farmers in southern part of State to try out Puerto Ricans in cooperation with Puerto Rican Employment Service. Results to date are not encouraging.
4. The Farm Bureau permit and bond to import not to exceed 600 Canadian farm workers for the period April 25 - October 1 has been approved in Washington. These Canadian workers all will be assigned to individual farmers by State Employment Service on basis of need and inability to recruit qualified domestic workers.
5. During peak harvest months intensive local recruiting through use of radio, press and civic organizations will be pressed in effort to interest part-time workers, vacationists, and temporarily unemployed workers, if any, in harvest work.

FARM PRICES

Summary of comments made by Thurston Adams, Economist of the Vermont Extension Service, at the PMA Conference, Friday, April 25, 1952.

Rather than attempting to cover the entire field of "Farm Prices," I wish to discuss only one price - the Boston Class I price under the Federal Order in that market. As you know, as a result of the hearing held early in the year, certain changes in the Boston Class I formula have become effective and a further hearing is being called probably beginning on May 12 to consider additional modifications. Since then the committee of economists who pioneered the new-type formula in 1947 have been hard at work and they have issued recommendations for improvement of the Boston fluid milk pricing formula. The Boston Milkshed Price Committee, which concluded on April 23 a series of meetings begun on March 14, will make the following recommendations at the public milk hearing expected to start in Boston on May 12.

1. That the formula keep the Class I price in line with changes in economic conditions since 1950.
2. That such price changes be related to a base price of \$5.36 a hundred-weight at plants in the basic 201-210-mile zone from Boston.
3. That the formula include a supply-demand adjustment which provides for prompter and smaller adjustments of the price than did the original supply-demand factor, and that the basis for adjustment be broadened to include the Lowell-Lawrence, Springfield and Worcester milk markets.
4. That the formula provide for greater seasonal variation in the Class I price, and that the seasonal premium be spread over six months rather than three months.
5. That the present method of determining the index of farm wage rates be simplified through the use of a New England index.

If the committee's recommendations were now in effect, the basic Class I price (before seasonal adjustment) would be the same as that provided by the present formula. As measured by the proposed supply-demand adjustment, milk production for the four federally regulated markets in New England having market-wide pools apparently has returned to good balance with fluid milk requirements. A move in the direction of a milk shortage condition next fall would promptly bring about upward price adjustments; while, on the other hand, a trend back toward a heavy surplus condition would be accompanied by downward adjustments.

In addition, the committee will reaffirm its conclusions (1) that the three economic factors - United States wholesale commodity prices, New England consumer income, and grain-labor cost of milk production - should continue to be given equal importance in the formula index; (2) that the 22-cent bracket system should be continued; and (3) that the present contraseasonal price provisions should remain in force.

Under the revised formula proposed by the committee, the first step would be to compute the formula index price by multiplying the familiar 3-way formula index on a 1950 base times the base price of \$5.36. The second step would be to adjust this price up or down by 0, 2, 4, 6, 8, or 10 percent, depending on the relationship of the milk supply to normal. For example, the latest available 2-month figures - those for February and March 1952 - indicate that the supply was 103.6 percent of normal. This would call for a 2 percent price decrease. With a normal or desirable level of supply, Class I milk assigned to producers in November would be 84 percent of receipts from producers. At the 10 percent extremes of operation, the supply would have to be 115 percent, or 85 percent of normal. The third step in the computation would be to multiply the price determined thus far by an index of seasonality. The seasonal indexes used closely parallel those employed in the New York market. The fourth and last step would be to round the price to the nearest price in the table currently used in the Boston market.

The Boston Milkshed Price Committee comprises: Dr. T. M. Adams, University of Vermont; Ellsworth W. Bell, University of Massachusetts; Dr. John D. Black, Harvard University; W. H. Bronson, Whiting Milk Company; Dr. George F. Dow, University of Maine, Chairman; James D. Lee, Federal Milk Market Administrator's office, Secretary; Dr. C. W. Swonger, New England Milk Producers' Association; William C. Welden, H. P. Hood and Sons, Inc; Clifton E. Whitney, Northern Farms Cooperative, Inc.

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT--THE AMERICAN WAY

Talk given by Harris W. Soule, Department of Agriculture Representative on New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee, at Spring Conference of Vermont Production and Marketing Administration, Burlington, Vermont, April 25, 1952.

I am glad to meet with your group to discuss the work of the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee because I believe the study being made by this committee and the recommendations to come from it may well be a milestone in the economic and social development of the area under consideration. It may well be a milestone in the social and economic development of the area for the simple reason that this is the first time that such a comprehensive study of the natural resources has been undertaken.

In the early days the settlers of New England and New York were concerned primarily with exploiting the resources to obtain a meager existence. They used the water ways for travel and shipping, while the forests yielded a ready source of income. Shipbuilding, fishing and trading were developed as important sources of income along the coast. The economy of one State depended very little upon what happened in a neighboring State. As the forests were cleared and the industrial and agricultural economy expanded, natural waterways were utilized for power development, industrial use, and all things for carrying sewage. Canals were developed to supplement the natural waterways to facilitate shipping. The growing centers of population in southern New England and New York became important markets for the products from the land.

The problems of one State became of increasing concern to the others. For instance, damaging floods in Massachusetts and Connecticut have become a concern of those States bordering the Connecticut River where control measures must be installed. So through the years the social and economic problems of New England and New York have become more closely integrated. The era of ruthless exploitation must give way to one in which careful planning is necessary for the wise development and utilization of our remaining natural resources. Otherwise our children, their children, and generations to come will be forced to accept a lower standard of living than that which we have enjoyed.

Abraham Lincoln once said, "If we can but know where we are and whether we are trending, we can best know what to do and how to do it." It seems to me that the study now being made by the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee will not only tell us "where we are" as applied to our natural resources, and the trends that have been developing, but it will give the various States involved and agencies of the Federal Government an opportunity to work out a comprehensive program for the wise use and future development of the land and water resources of this area.

I believe there will be three distinct benefits resulting from the study without considering programs which may be authorized from the recommendations in the report. These are:

1. Closer coordination of the activities of the agencies within the Department of Agriculture dealing with land and water resources.

2. A better understanding and integration of the several programs affecting these resources now being administered by Federal agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Federal Power Commission, and the Department of the Interior, to mention a few.
3. A more effective working relationship will be developed between the Federal agencies as well as between these agencies and corresponding State Departments concerned with the development of natural resources.

I believe these benefits will result in a saving of millions of dollars, thereby justifying the study regardless of other beneficial developments which may come from it.

The New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee is, as the name implies, a committee of Federal agency representatives established by the Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture, Army, Commerce, Interior, the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency. The Governor of each State has been invited to participate in the activities of the Committee. In all cases either the Governor or his representative sits with the Committee.

The Flood Control Act of 1950 placed responsibility on the Department of the Army to survey the "Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and their tributaries and such other streams" in New England "where power development appears feasible and practicable, to determine the hydro-electric potentialities in combination with other water and resource development." In approving the Flood Control Act of 1950, the President stated, I quote: "that this assignment of responsibility obviously involves the work of other Federal agencies and of the States as well as the Department of the Army, and those other agencies and the States should participate in the planning work;" end of quote. The President further pointed out that the Act did not specify the several other purposes, aside from the development of power, which should be considered in order to prepare proper resource development plans; yet soil, forest, fish and wildlife conservation and management, stream pollution abatement, improved domestic and municipal water supplies, farm land treatment measures, and recreational development are highly important to the future growth of the Northeastern States.

In a letter dated October 9, 1950, addressed to the Secretaries of the Departments aforementioned, the President requested that the Secretaries cooperate by establishing an inter-agency committee to make a comprehensive study of this New England-New York area. I am quoting from the President's letter:

"In order to realize to the greatest extent possible under existing authority the benefits which would stem from this legislation and to provide essential coordination of the activities of the various Federal agencies in studying the resources potential of this area, I am requesting that the various Federal agencies concerned, including your Department, organize a temporary inter-agency committee for the purpose of initiating a comprehensive survey of the resources of this region, and preparing recommendations for the development, utilization and conservation of these resources. In view of the general provisions of Section 205 of Public Law 516, I am designating the Department of the Army as the Chairman agency. The survey to be conducted by this inter-agency committee should include the six New England States and New York State. Of course, the committee can exclude from the survey

any parts of this area whose resources are not well suited for consideration in a general survey of this kind. The committee should take into consideration the resources of the areas in this region which are of mutual interest to the United States and Canada, such as the Passamaquoddy Bay, with due regard to pertinent international agreements between the two countries. You will recognize, of course, the responsibility of the Department of State in these matters. That Department, therefore, should be consulted on issues affecting these areas.

"In serving on this committee, each agency should make its contribution under existing laws and in accordance with its responsibilities under such laws. And it is most important that the efforts of the various agencies be integrated from the very beginning of the investigation if the benefits of all coordination possible under existing law and procedures are to be obtained. The final product of the inter-agency survey should be a single comprehensive report setting forth the coordinated findings of all the participating agencies."

Each agency and the committee as a whole is attempting to coordinate its plans and activities with those of interested State and local agencies. The State and local agencies have a direct and vital interest in the conduct of this investigation and the report that will result. Again quoting the President:

"I am sure that State and local agencies will be anxious to cooperate. In order that they be afforded every opportunity and encouragement to participate in the work of the committee, I am asking the Governors of the seven States concerned to designate official representatives to act as liaison between the committee and the various State agencies concerned with resource development. In addition, I want the committee to invite the ideas and help of local governments and private groups and individuals to the extent possible. It is essential that the Federal agencies draw upon the experience and ideas of the people of the region to the fullest extent and that the final report carry the concurrence or comments of each affected State;" end of quote.

This comprehensive study being made of land and water resources of the New England-New York area includes among other matters, coverage of electric power generation and transmission, forest management, fish and wildlife conservation, flood control, mineral development, municipal and industrial water supply, navigation, pollution control, recreation, and soil conservation. The necessary first step in such a study is an inventory of the land, water, and all of the related natural resources available for utilization, together with a survey of the projected regional and national requirements which might be met through more effective utilization of the natural resources of the region. When these basic facts on resources and needs have been collected and analyzed, the committee will then proceed to determine what development and conservation projects are feasible and desirable, and to prepare recommendations for specific action to carry them out.

Again I want to call your attention to the three phases of the job to be done:

1. The inventory of land and water resources and a statement of their present condition.
2. An analysis of the problems involved.
3. Recommendations for wise use and future development of these resources.

We are now in the inventory stage. I am sure many of you present have been asked for your estimates of the land treatment and water management practices needed for an adequate program for the conservation and improvement of farm land and farm water supply. Later this year will come the analysis of the problems facing the area, following which the Committee will make a report of its recommendations. This report is due for completion June 30, 1954. I want to emphasize that in establishing the Committee the President called attention to the fact that State and local agencies have a direct and vital interest in this investigation and the report that will result. The Governor of each State will have an opportunity to review and concur with the report or make comments concerning it.

This is an excellent example of looking ahead or planning in the American way. The "grass roots" have a voice instead of being told by a small group at the top that certain plans have been made without regard to local views. How different this approach is from the dictatorial method where the plans are made by a select few who also determine just how they will be executed. If there is serious opposition, those who differ are apt to be "executed" along with the plans.

Let's take a look at the area being studied. Roughly, it is bounded on the north by Van Buren, Maine, on the south by New York City, on the west by Buffalo and Lake Erie, and on the east by Boston and the Atlantic Ocean. You may well ask why were New England and New York chosen as the areas to be studied. The answer I believe is that the economy of the area is closely integrated and when you consider electric power, I am sure you will agree that any plan made that did not recognize the proposed developments of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers would be sadly incomplete. I think you will agree that this northeastern part of the United States has an economy which is closely integrated and the problems of one State directly affect all others. It has a population of over 24 million people, roughly 16 percent of the total population of the country. It has an approximate land area of 111,000 square miles, or about 4 percent of the land area of the United States, so you can readily see it has one of the heaviest concentrations of population in the country. Of the total land area, there are more than 28 million acres in farms. Over 44 million acres are forest land, including State and National forests, farm woodland, and large industrial forests. There is a heavy concentration of industries, many of which are the oldest in the country. The metropolitan markets for agricultural commodities are an important determining factor in the agricultural economy of the region.

Much information about these northeastern States is already in the possession of the various State Departments concerned with conservation and development of natural resources. The New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee could never complete the study within the time available if it were not for the cooperation of the States in supplying these facts.

My particular responsibility on this Committee is to represent the Department of Agriculture which is concerned with the conservation and improvement of the land resources to increase production and retard water run-off with proper safeguards for water for agricultural uses. As representative of the Department of Agriculture I serve as the coordinator of the Agricultural Study and Report Group charged with the responsibility of developing the agricultural phase of the study. Likewise, the Army Corps of Engineers has responsibility for developing the drainage and flood control aspects of the study; the Federal Power Commission, the power study; Department of Interior, those problems concerning recreation, mineral resources, and fish and wildlife; whereas, the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency has charge of the studies on pollution, public health and insect control, and public water supply. Representatives of the Department of Agriculture concerned with the problems under consideration are serving on all of these committees.

The agricultural study is being carried on in cooperation with representatives of the State Departments of Agriculture and Forestry, the State land-grant colleges and experiment stations, and the State and county organizations of the Forest Service, the Production and Marketing Administration, and the Soil Conservation Service. The study will give us an inventory of the land resources as well as recommendations for those land treatment measures which will not only improve the soils and promote higher yields, but which will also retard the run-off of water, thereby contributing to the conservation of water for agricultural uses and flood control. It becomes more and more apparent that more attention must be given to flood control on the smaller tributaries of our rivers. More and more people believe that an adequate land treatment program supplemented by small dams upstream are a necessary complement to the larger dams on the main stream.

You PMA committeemen and workers are making a definite contribution to the study which is being made, county by county, throughout the area. I hope that you will continue to give it your leadership and, working with representatives of the Federal agricultural agencies operating in your county, develop the best possible recommendations for your county.

In closing I can enthusiastically say that I have enjoyed very much my contacts with the various Federal and State representatives working on this study of the land and water resources of the New England-New York area. It offers a challenge to the leadership of the States and Federal agencies working together to cooperatively develop a comprehensive program for our land and water resources which will affect every last person living in this area. I am sure that we can meet this challenge and every one of us will be proud that we have had a part in the effort.



PMA State Conference
Burlington, Vermont
April 24 and 25, 1952

Program Planning Recommendations - 1953 ACP

The committee on program planning submits the following recommendations for consideration of the full conference. For convenience, these recommendations are listed as nearly as possible in the order in which they arise in the handbook of practices.

1. Amount of assistance available for each county

The committee feels that the present basis for allocating program funds should be continued in 1953. That is, 1/3 weight to acres of cropland, 1/3 weight to animal units and 1/3 weight to participation. The suggestion was made that we continue to study ways and means of better methods of allocation including the possibility of the use of conservation needs estimates as prepared by counties in the future.

2. Amount of assistance available for each farm

The committee feels that the various counties have done a good job in analyzing the best methods of allocating program funds to individual farms. They urge the counties to continue studying ways and means of making the best possible breakdown among the farmers in their counties. The committee recommends that the final decision as to the guide to be used in each county be determined by the individual county committees.

3. Program year and enrollment date

The committee believes that the calendar year is satisfactory for the establishment of a program year and is unanimously in favor of the provision for allowing a farmer to carry out practices starting October 1 of the year previous to the program year involved.

The committee discussed in detail the pros and cons of the final enrollment date. The group recognized the value of establishing an early enrollment date and agreed to work toward this end. In Vermont, they feel that the date of January 1 is satisfactory as the final enrollment date. It was understood that any county wanting to set an earlier date for final enrollment could do so.

4. General policies

The group believes that it is very important that a good farm visit be made. They urge all counties to work toward a better farm visit in 1953. This should include proper training of community committeemen and making available to them all the necessary material such as soil test reports, maps when available, records of previous treatment, etc. They feel that the procedure of approving practices that were carried out in the State in 1952 will be satisfactory in 1953.

5. Prior approval of practice substitution

The committee recommends that we continue to require prior approval of practice substitution.

6. Farm maps

The group recognizes the value of farm maps especially in connection with soil sampling and records of pH and land treatment. They urge all counties to work with existing farm maps and to work toward the end of getting farm maps available to all farmers as soon as possible.

7. Farm plans

The committee recognizes the value of farm plans in making farm visits and of utilizing the ACP program to the best possible advantage. They suggest to county committees that they hold meetings with Soil Conservation district people, Soil Conservation Service people, the Farmers Home Administration and others, who are working on farm plans with farmers, in order that the county and community committeemen may be more thoroughly acquainted with these plans and make the best possible use of them when contacting the farmer in regard to the Agricultural Conservation Program.

8. Conservation Materials and Services

The group unanimously approved the continuation of furnishing conservation materials under contract in 1953.

The group recommends that any county that wants to should be allowed to use the Purchase Order Plan for permanent type practices. They do not recommend the use of the contract plan and the Purchase Order Plan for the same kind of practice in a given county.

The kind of materials or services and the type of delivery to be furnished in any individual county should be left up to the county group.

The committee recommends a uniform basis for arriving at cash collection State-wide. They favor the following:

For superphosphate, the farmer should pay half of the cost.

For lime, the farmer should pay 40% of the cost.

For mixed fertilizer, the farmer should pay 60% of the cost.

In any county that other materials or services are furnished, the amount of cash collection to the farmer should follow the same pattern as the above-mentioned items. These should be worked out individually between the county committee and the State committee.

9. Soil sampling

The committee recognizes the value of the soil sampling service and urges counties to continue a strong sampling program. The amount of samples to be taken and the time they should be taken should be left up to the individual county. The group did not favor the system whereby PMA would pay the laboratory testing costs.

10. Approved practices and rates of payment

The group had no recommended changes in connection with Practices 1 through 5.

Practice 6 - The group discussed the rate of payment that should be established for this practice and agreed that it should be the same as in 1952. They recommend that the requirement for the number of maple trees to be planted be changed from 300 per acre to 200 per acre.

Practice No. 7 - Several county recommendations were considered in connection with proposed changes in this practice of improving woodlands. It appeared from the recommendations that there was quite a lot of disagreement among the counties and among county foresters and other foresters as to just how the wording should be made up.

The group agreed with the general philosophy that, if a payment would stimulate a better cutting job and leave a better stand of trees, it was justified even though some harvest cutting may have been made on the area.

Since there were so many different suggestions on this practice, the group recommended that the State PMA Committee and the State Agricultural Resources group review the various recommendations and draw up final recommendations for the practice.

We recommend that a standard rate of not to exceed \$15.00 per acre be set up on this practice thus eliminating the 70% figure.

Practice No. 8 - The rate of payment for this practice of improving a sugar grove or bush should be the same as that for Practice 7.

Practice No. 10 - No recommended changes for this practice of clearing land for pasture or hay.

Practice No. 14 - The feasibility of increasing the cost of this practice of construction of riprap was discussed and the group recommended that it remain as in 1952.

Practice No. 15 - We recommend that the first sentence of this practice of constructing farm ponds be changed to read "to be used for livestock."

Practice No. 17 - The committee recommended that the State PMA Committee and the ARC group discuss the details of how this practice of establishing permanent sod waterways should be worded taking into consideration the recommendations made by counties.

11. New practices

The committee discussed the feasibility of establishing a practice for the use of sawdust and recommended that no such practice be established at this time. Since some of the counties had suggestions for other practices, we recommend that they work them out within the special county practices provision.

We recommend that no payment be made on the use of nitrogen fertilizer.

We do not favor the establishment of a practice for the construction of farm ponds for fire control in connection with farm woodlands.

Since there is some interest in the practice of scarifying woodlands, we suggest that the decision as to whether or not this practice be offered be left to the State FMA Committee and details worked out with the State ARC group.

We do not recommend the revision of the planting of forest trees practice to include a percent of the cost of land preparation.

12. Agricultural Resources Conservation Program

We urge all county committees to work closely with the Agricultural Resources Conservation groups in their counties and to make sure that our ACP program be made to do its part in carrying out the intent of the overall conservation program for the county.

Respectfully submitted,

L. Earl Wilson

For the Program Planning Committee

L. Earl Wilson, Chairman
G. N. Baldwin, Vice Chairman
Almon F. Heald, Secretary

Other members of the Program Planning Committee

Edgar W. Smith, Addison County
Ball L. Lyons, Bennington County
Norman Lowe, Caledonia County
G. N. Baldwin, Chittenden County
George R. Ramsay, Essex County
Stuart Newton, Franklin County
George Caswell, Grand Isle County
Lawrence Gregory, Lamoille County
F. Milo Leighton, Orange County
Asa R. Drown, Orleans County
Willard H. Smith, Rutland County
W. J. Bisson, Washington County
Charles B. Holton, Windham County
William Stone, Windsor County

This report is based on the conference committee recommendations and includes the changes as adopted by the general conference.

PMA STATE CONFERENCE
Burlington, Vermont
April 24-25, 1952

Report of Conference Committee on Public Relations

The meeting was called to order at 1:45 p.m. by Chairman E. K. Wright.

The members of the Public Relations Committee were introduced and these included:

E. K. Wright, Chairman
Edson Gifford, Vice Chairman
Thomas H. Blow, Secretary
Sedgewick Preston, Addison County
E. W. Mattison, Bennington County
Clarence Burrington, Caledonia County
E. S. Sibley, Chittenden County
C. E. Wright, Essex County
Floyd Weld, Franklin County
Robert White, Grand Isle County
Howard Kittell, Lamoille County
Edson Gifford, Orange County
Verne Dunn, Orleans County
James Brayton, Rutland County
E. P. Bordeaux, Washington County
Claude Bensenhaver, Windham County

Others who sat in on part of the meeting were:

Charles Kiefer, PMA Commodity Office, New York City
Colin Cassady, State Committeeman, New Hampshire
Don Elberson, Vermont State Farm Bureau Office
Arthur Packard, Vermont State Farm Bureau Office
Clarence J. McCormick, Under Secretary of Agriculture
Leon Brainerd, Chairman, Vermont State PMA Committee

Mr. Wright opened the afternoon's discussion with a review of what was carried out during 1951 and stressed the point that public relations was the eye through which farmers and consumers were able to learn more about PMA activities. He also stressed the point that there was need for a better job being done in 1952 and more definite plans being developed and followed through. For the purpose of making the public relations work more effective the afternoon's discussion was broken up into two parts - primary and secondary considerations. In this way it was felt that certain features which were more necessary in doing a good public relations job could thus be given more time and make them more effective. The general outline which was developed in January of 1952 was followed and the following items were listed as those that should receive primary consideration: News Releases, Radio Work, Meetings with Organizations, Keeping Congressional Delegates Informed, Farmer-Businessman Dinners, and Study Groups. Those listed as of secondary importance include: Special Feature Stories, Publications, County Newsletters, Conservation Information for the Clergy, Conservation Bulletins for Schools, County ACP Tours, Exhibits, and Visual Aids.

PRIMARY

News Releases

The group voted that the present methods of issuing news releases should be continued and that column material such as is published, for example, by Mr. Wild of the Rutland Herald be clipped and sent out to county editors and county offices throughout the State. It was felt that by doing this the importance of carrying good news material would be stressed to these people.

Radio

The group felt that greater use should be made of special tape recordings featuring ACP program results at the county and community levels. It was also suggested that more ^{advance} advertising as to the time and station use of these tapes should be made.

Meetings with Organizations

There was considerable discussion of this phase of the work and it was the feeling of the group that committeemen and county offices were falling down very badly in such work with organizations such as Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, etc. The feeling of the group was that these clubs were made up of consumers who very definitely should be interested in what agricultural programs had to offer. The suggestion was made that a list of available speakers from PMA should be given to the program chairman of such organizations and that their services be offered for club meetings.

Keeping Congressional Delegates Informed

In this particular category much good can be done and must be done if we are to keep those people who are responsible for Congressional action informed. Several examples were brought out by the committee members showing that Congressmen and Senators were a very much uninformed group about farm programs in particular. In keeping with this feature it is recommended that the State Office continue its policy of sending to the Vermont Congressional delegates information that was being made available about the program in the State and also that committeemen who are getting good results from practices should also keep in touch with their Congressional delegates from time to time, pointing out the good that they were receiving for the dollars that were appropriated.

Farmer-Businessman Dinners

The group was unanimous in its recommendation that all counties should seriously consider the holding of farmer-businessman get-togethers as soon as possible. It was felt that this was a very important feature to bring the story of the contribution being made by ACP to Vermont Agriculture.

Study Groups

Mr. Elberson was asked to review the value of Study Groups in fostering ACP information throughout the State. He recommended that at least one meeting per year should be held in every neighborhood group for the purpose of discussing agricultural conservation. In this way it would be possible to get the pulse of the farm people as to what they thought about farm programs. He did not recommend that more than one meeting per year would be necessary for such a purpose. He also recommended that PMA committeeman membership in neighborhood clubs was essential and very necessary if the story at the community level were to be well and fairly presented. He suggested that January was the best month for such discussions. It was also recommended that all requests for discussions through neighborhood clubs would have to be cleared through the Farm Bureau Educational Committee.

SECONDARY

Special Feature Stories

The group recommended that special feature stories should be continued in the largely circulated newspapers, magazines, and company house organs. It was not felt that these should be used to the extent that they might overshadow/more regular press release type of stories.

Publications

The group recommended that the State Practice Bulletin or Handbook should be continued on a printed basis and that sponsorship should be through local advertisers. It was further recommended that such sponsorship should be extended to all who might be interested in advertising in the handbook.

County Newsletters

The recent March 1952 survey of county newsletters in 4 counties was reviewed and formed the background for discussion on this particular subject. The committee stated that the clergy in each county were very much interested in these letters and should be included on the mailing list to receive them. The matter of making these county newsletters available to all county farmers was discussed but it was felt that this would not be an economic method of distribution. The group also felt that committeemen fell down very badly in assisting the county secretaries with local material for their use each month in these newsletters. The committee voted that all counties should consider the publication of newsletters at least quarterly.

Conservation Information for Clergy

It was recommended that mailing lists of all clergy within the counties should be kept up to date and that they should be sent all material which would be helpful to them in carrying the story of conservation to their parishioners. It was further recommended that at meetings such as the Annual PMA Conference a member of the clergy should be asked to preside at the opening of each meeting and offer the invocation. Through this medium the clergy would be better informed as to our State program procedures.

Conservation Bulletins for Schools

The committee voted that we should continue our cooperation with schools through the Department of Education in making available to teachers all of the conservation information that it is possible to get into their hands. It was recommended that one of the mediums through which conservation material could be taken out to rural areas was through the bookwagon.

County ACP Tours

It was voted that the State Committee recommend to all counties that tours could be held this year where such interest was shown and where money was available for this purpose. The final decision on this matter was to be left up to the counties. The group felt that tours should be made to see every-day practical results and that the groups should be expanded so as to include consumers, other business men, etc. It was felt that within-the-county tours were probably more effective than those which carried folks to distant places. In arranging for tours it was recommended that county agents should be worked with very closely.

Exhibits

The recommendation was made that suitcase exhibits should be continued and made available for fall fairs, field days, etc. The story told by these suitcase exhibits was easy to grasp and remember by those seeing them. The suggestion was made that a greater use could be made of these exhibits by placing them in schools throughout the State for short periods of time when they were not being used at fairs, field days, and other purposes. One recommendation was that these exhibits could be increased in size and thus make them somewhat more effective.

Visual Aids

The group recommended that more new agricultural conservation sound films should be developed and made available for use at the State level. At the present time it is nearly impossible to get an up-to-date moving picture which discusses agricultural conservation. The group was told that a new series of slides discussing the Vermont ACP was now in preparation and should be available by mid-year. The continued use of slides at the State and county levels was felt to be of great assistance to the program.

Miscellaneous

During the meeting the Public Relations Committee reviewed the problem of holding more effective election meetings. It was felt that with the great competition that existed for peoples' time, it was necessary to use every possible means such as refreshments, dances, personal contact, etc., to get people to attend. Several excellent examples of these were pictured to the group. In Franklin County personal contacts were made by the committeemen during the day of the meeting to get the people out and this method proved very effective. It was recommended that such a method be tried in other counties.

Miscellaneous (Continued)

The use of ACP barn cards was felt to be an effective method of pointing out to community people that conservation practices were being followed on individual farms.

E. K. Wright

E. K. Wright, Chairman
Edson Gifford, Vice Chairman
Thomas H. Blow, Secretary

This report is based on the conference committee recommendations and includes the changes as adopted by the general conference.



PMA STATE CONFERENCE
Burlington, Vermont
April 24 and 25, 1952

Report of the Administrative Problems Committee

The committee wishes to make the following recommendations for the consideration of the conference as a whole in regard to the administration of the PMA programs at the county level:

We recommend:

1. That county committees continue to invite community committeemen to attend county committee meetings from time to time and suggest that at least the chairman of each community committee be invited to attend at least one meeting per year.
2. That a two-day training school be held at the discretion of the county committee, one day being given to detailed instructions on sign-up and checking performance, and one day on field work.
3. That community elections be held prior to training schools and that new committeemen take office at once.
4. That each county hold an ACP tour for community committeemen and that transportation only be paid out of administrative funds.
5. That an agenda be prepared for every county committee meeting and that it be sent to the committee members and fieldman prior to the date of the meeting.
6. That the county committeemen supervise more closely the operations of the consignees and that one county committeeman be notified by the consignee or freight agent when cars arrive.
7. That county committeemen especially recognize new community committeemen and see that they are familiarized with the program, its background and objectives, and with their duties and responsibilities.
8. That, since the printed Practice Handbook is an effective means of presenting the program to farmers and others, it be continued.

This committee also wished to present their sentiments regarding State PMA conferences:

- A. That Burlington is the best location for the conference.
- B. That the Hotel Vermont is the most convenient place in the city to hold the conference.
- C. That a date at the end of April is most suitable.
- D. That the present program for a working conference of 4 committees is entirely satisfactory.

Members of the Committee:

<u>Committeeman</u>	<u>County</u>
Howard A. Foster	Addison
John T. Lourie	Bennington
Donald Laroque	Caledonia
Ray W. Collins	Chittenden
Ray W. French	Essex
Marshall Dunham	Franklin
Ernest Prairie	Grand Isle
Arthur Stancliff	Lamoille
Glen A. Button	Orange
Clyde Vance	Orleans
Charles Winslow	Rutland
*D. Drew Bisbee	Washington
Myron W. Allen	Windham
Ruel Abbott	Windsor

*Mr. Bisbee was absent

Hugh E. Evans

Hugh E. Evans, Chairman
Clyde Vance, Vice Chairman
C. B. Doane, Secretary

This report is based on the conference committee recommendations and includes the changes as adopted by the general conference.

VERMONT STATE PMA OFFICE

PMA State Conference
Burlington, Vermont
April 24-25, 1952

Report of the Conference Committee on Agricultural Mobilization

The subcommittee of the State PMA Conference on mobilization called their meeting to order at 1:30 P.M. April 24 with Chairman Thomas Macauley presiding. Mr. Macauley stated that the purpose of this subcommittee was to discuss ways and means in which PMA personnel can best contribute to the agricultural mobilization effort. The subcommittee offers the following report for adoption:

I. The Production Program

It is the feeling that farmers should be furnished more information currently on production needs. PMA personnel and others should help in every way possible. There are many items that should reach county mobilization committees, PMA personnel and community committeemen. We recommend the continued use of newsletters to county and community committeemen, county agents and the members of county mobilization committees.

In addition to this, news releases from the Extension Service on production items should be continued. Radio should also be used where possible.

In connection with production problems, we recognize that it is important to be kept informed on grain prospects in the West. To this end, Vermont farmers should be advised through all means possible including items in the newsletter and the corn and grain crop reports and their outlook in the United States. It is believed that, if farmers are given this information, they can make up their own minds as to how much home grain to produce in the State. It was recommended that small grains be grown on land not needed for silage, hay or pasture. It is expected that some oats and barley will be grown this year, especially on the west side of the State.

Under milk production, it was felt that, with the embargo on Canadian cattle and high beef prices, many dairy cows would be sold which might affect the volume of milk production. It was agreed that the cost of production must be considered in comparison with the price of milk.

Farmers must farm efficiently in order to keep cost in line with price. The Green Pastures program is helping in holding up production at lower cost. Potato acreage in Vermont will not likely vary from the acreage grown in 1951. The present high price of potatoes will likely encourage more farmers to grow a small acreage for their own use.

It should be pointed out to PMA committeemen that it is their job to keep the State Office informed of items pertinent to production in their area. This may be done through the newsletters sent to committeemen.

II. Farm Labor

Based on a report made by Merrill Walker, Vermont Employment Service, it is clear that there will be a definite shortage of good farm help this summer. Mr. Walker reported that 600 permits for Canadian help will be available for this year as compared with 400 permits last year. These Canadians are employed principally in the northern half of Vermont. The southern half of the State will get some help through the Volunteer Youth Organization. It was reported that most high school boys available as

farm labor are used in their own locality. Some Puerto Rico help is used in the southern end of the State.

The best way to keep the community committeemen informed of the labor situation is by use of the county newsletter. In addition, the work being carried on between PMA and the Vermont Employment Service should be continued. Farm labor representatives should keep in touch with county and community committeemen.

III. Selective Service

It was agreed that in general there is good cooperation between county draft boards and county mobilization committees. Most farm boys are informed as to the procedure required for deferment. It was agreed that in general the Selective Service has not depleted farm labor any more now that it did last year.

IV. Farm Machinery and Supplies

The group discussed the present supply of machinery and equipment in dealers' yards and it was felt that there is at present an ample supply of machinery and repairs. It was also stated that, since many dealers frequently inform farmers of the machinery on hand, farmers needing such equipment should be able to find it.

The PMA should continue to issue information through established channels on priority information. Community committeemen should be asked to keep in touch with the local situation and keep the county and State offices informed in regard to orders needed for supplies and farm machinery.

V. Agricultural Price Information

This committee recognizes that there is a need for getting out good price information to farmers.

We recommend that PMA continue to work with the Extension Service in getting out this type of information. When it is developed, it should also be included in county newsletters.

It is recommended that the Vermont State PMA Office work closely with the Office of Price Stabilization in getting out information on price ceilings which affect our farmers. This information should be written as concisely and understandably as possible. The agricultural mobilization groups should be kept informed on these items. The Office of Price Stabilization should be contacted in regard to this.

VI. Production Adjustments and Price Supports

The group reviewed the present programs being carried on that are important to Vermont and they agreed that steps should be taken to get out more information to county and community committeemen on the following:

- A. Milk Price Support and Marketing Program.
- B. Apple Purchase Program.
- C. School Lunch Program.
- D. Information on price supports that affect the price of grain.

It was recommended that this type of information should also be included in the newsletters sent out to county and community committeemen.

VII. Civilian Defense

The committee discussed this phase of the mobilization program and agreed that each county mobilization committee should keep informed on developments of Civilian Defense and be prepared to render assistance to local defense agents should occasion arise. Any activities of Civilian Defense should be reported in the county newsletters so that county and community committeemen would be informed.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas F. Macauley

For the Agricultural Mobilization Committee

Thomas F. Macauley, Chairman
Clyde Bryant, Vice Chairman
Edward N. Blondin, Secretary

Others present:

Wayne Fuller, Addison County
Clyde Bryant, Bennington County
Arthur Messier, Caledonia County
J. W. Williams, Chittenden County
Earle Clark, Essex County
B. Frank Myott, Franklin County
Alan Kinney, Grand Isle County
Lawrence Sinclair, Lamoille County
Ray Rogers, Orange County
Lisle Bean, Orleans County
Arthur Davison, Rutland County
W. I. Goodrich, Washington County
Ralph A. Andrews, Windham County
Max Rogers, Windsor County
Merrill Walker, Vermont Employment Service
George Bailey, Rochester, Vermont
Leon N. Brainerd, Chairman, State Mobilization Committee
Clarence J. McCormick, Under Secretary of Agriculture
Philip Grime, County Agent, Caledonia County

This report is based on the conference committee recommendations and includes the changes as adopted by the general conference.

Report of Secretaries-Treasurers Meeting, April 24, 1952

Secretaries-Treasurers Present

Mrs. Edla Browne - Addison County
John J. DeVito - Bennington County
Mrs. Mildred Murphy - Caledonia County
Miss Dorothy Howard - Chittenden County
Miss Mildred Bell - Essex County
Miss Avis Bronson - Franklin County
Miss Grace Hazen - Grand Isle County
Miss Hazel Hoyt - Lamoille County
Miss Louise Rand - Orange County
Mrs. Arlene Routhier - Orleans County
Mrs. Marguerite Davison - Rutland County
Miss Marjorie Leith - Washington County
Miss Mae Carpenter - Windham County
Miss Betty Dutton - Windsor County

The following is a short resume of the secretaries-treasurers meeting held during the afternoon of April 24, 1952.

Highlights of Radio Broadcasting

The group met at Radio Station WJOY at 1:30 P.M. Mr. Dick Burt of Station WJOY talked to the group on radio broadcasting. During the talk he brought out several pointers on the art of radio broadcasting, such as the correct distance from which to talk into the microphone, voice inflection, etc. He told the group that when broadcasting to just be your natural self. He said that naturalness is the most important thing. Before you start to talk, he said to yawn, which would tend to relax your neck muscles, or smile, which would tend to relax your facial muscles. Each person present had the opportunity to read a short paragraph on the tape recorder and have it played back. It was very interesting to hear your own voice over the air for the first time. Some voices sounded very natural. In writing for radio, Mr. Burt told us to be sure not to have long sentences. They should be brief. From comments heard after the hour was over, it is my impression that those who attended this meeting found it interesting and instructive.

County Newsletter Preparation

The group left the radio station at 2:30 for the State Office, meeting in the conference room on the third floor. The next item on the agenda was a panel discussion on county newsletters. Mrs. Mildred Murphy acted as chairman of the panel, and was assisted by Miss Mildred Bell and Miss Louise Rand. Miss Bell told the group how she prepared her newsletters, obtained her illustrations, time spent in the preparation of them, and circulation made. She also told them where she procured her cuts for the letters, how she draws her pictures and the type of stylus she uses for drawing them. She feels that it is important to have pictures in a newsletter, since they have eye-catching appeal. Miss Bell sends out a monthly newsletter to a mailing list of about 50 people, which includes county committeemen, community committeemen, SCS technicians, county forester, county secretaries-treasurers and any others who may request a copy. In summing up the contents of a newsletter, Mildred says that all it really takes is:

Some Yankee ingenuity---
Some pictures and some facts,
Some thinking and some planning,
And some gentle jokes and whacks---
A wise crack added now and then,
Some information true,
Some data and statistics
Stating when the program's due.
Occasionally some dates we set
And meeting plans are met---
All add to a newsletter
Which the people like to get.
And when each month the letter's done
And posted in the mail,
You feel relieved and well informed
By every mere detail.
It isn't difficult at all,
In fact it's really fun---
And all at once you're finished,
When you thought you'd just begun.

Miss Rand is continually sending out newsletters to her county mailing list. She takes statistical data from her progress reports. She also gets items of interest from her Extension Agents.

Mrs. Murphy stated that the County Agent, Home Demonstration Agent and 4-H Club Agent all give material to her for the county newsletter. Material is also received from county and community committeemen. It takes her about a day to prepare her newsletter.

I feel that these girls did an excellent job in the preparation and handling of this assignment.

Hospitalization Insurance

After the panel discussion on the preparation of county newsletters, Mr. Paul Marsden, representative of the New Hampshire-Vermont Hospitalization Service discussed hospitalization services with the group. Several persons showed some interest in this type of insurance and questions were asked Mr. Marsden concerning it. Since some persons present are carrying Farm Bureau insurance, the rates and premiums in connection with this insurance were discussed. Mr. Marsden advised those carrying Farm Bureau insurance to still maintain it in addition to Blue Cross, should they enroll in the Blue Cross Plan. The group was asked to decide whether or not they wanted to enroll in the plan, the rate they would prefer, type of service wanted, and give this information to Mrs. Saunders. The group asked her to act as collection agent, should a sufficient number indicate they would like to enroll. The majority of the group favored the quarterly payment plan.

Note: On March 4, 1952, the State PMA Office staff had both Donald E. Evans, Farm Bureau Insurance representative of the Burlington, Vermont office and Paul Marsden, representative of the New Hampshire-Vermont Hospitalization Service, at a general staff conference to explain their respective hospitalization and insurance plans. In addition to this conference, several of the county secretaries had previously inquired as to the Blue Cross Plan and Mr. Marsden was asked to review this at one session of the Secretaries-Treasurers Conference on April 24, 1952.

General Program Discussions

After this discussion ended, the group adjourned to the main floor, where light refreshments were served. The group then broke up into two groups of five and one of four. These groups met with Mrs. Saunders for a general discussion of problems in connection with county accounts and audits, Mrs. Abell for conservation materials problems, and Miss Tudhope for problems in connection with the procurement of supplies and applications for payment.

The secretaries-treasurers meeting adjourned at 5:15 P.M.

Resumé submitted by: Bertha D. Saunders
Mrs. Bertha D. Saunders
Clerk

OTHER CONFERENCE HIGHLIGHTS

Secretaries Honored

At the conference banquet, seven county secretaries-treasurers who had served a total of 97 years since the start of ACP in 1936 were honored with Certificates of Service Awards by Chairman Leon N. Brainerd, for the Vermont State PMA Committee.

The group included:

15 Years or More of Service

John J. DeVito	- Bennington County
Dorothy Howard	- Chittenden County
Mildred Bell	- Essex County
Hazel Hoyt	- Lamoille County
Marguerite Davison (Mrs.)	- Rutland County

10 Years or More of Service

Mildred Murphy (Mrs.)	- Caledonia County
Grace Hazen	- Grand Isle County

Macaulneys Honored

Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Macauley of Shoreham, who had just celebrated their 40th wedding anniversary, were honored at the banquet and presented a gift by Mr. Brainerd on behalf of the Vermont State PMA Committee.

Entertainment

A new feature at the banquet was the rendering of several excellent numbers by one of the Burlington Barber Shop Quartets--The Maple Sugar Four. This part of the banquet program was provided through the courtesy of the Vermont State PMA Committee.

Guests

PMA representatives from Massachusetts and New Hampshire attended the 1952 conference. We were glad to have them with us. They included:

New Hampshire

Colin Cassady	- Member, New Hampshire State PMA Committee
Warren Rogers	- New Hampshire PMA Fieldman

Massachusetts

Harold Tompson	- Chairman, Massachusetts State PMA Committee
----------------	---

KNOWLEDGE IS THE ANTIDOTE TO FEAR

"Our Nation is strong and free. Our people are healthy and vigorous. The knowledge of our immense National vitality and strength should be a real antidote to foolish and unfounded fears.

"There is no threat inside our borders, or outside, that we cannot meet, provided we are resolute both in searching out facts and in rejecting prefabricated fears.

"There is no threat, outside or inside, that we cannot meet if we use our growing knowledge to strengthen the sinews of American democracy."

By Charles F. Brannan
U. S. Secretary of Agriculture
at U.V.M. Town and Country Days

April 2, 1952

